



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/782,412	02/13/2001	Gary P. Mousseau	555255012194	3123
7590	03/01/2005			EXAMINER EDELMAN, BRADLEY E
David B. Cochran, Esq. Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue North Point 901 Lakeside Avenue Cleveland, OH 44114			ART UNIT 2153	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/782,412	MOUSSEAU ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Bradley Edelman	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2004.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 34 and 38-52 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 34 and 38-52 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 13 February 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/6/04.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is in response to Applicant's request for continued examination filed on December 6, 2004. Claims 34 and 38-52 are presented for further examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 34 and 38-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In considering claim 34, the phrase "the message attachments" on lines 7-8 of the claim is ambiguous because it is not clear whether it is referring to all attachments mentioned in the preamble or only the attachment mentioned on line 4 of the claim. It appears that the phrase should read "the message attachment."

Claims 38-52 depend from claim 34, and are thus rejected as well.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 34 and 38-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to

one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In considering claim 34, the claim requires the steps of transmitting from the mobile device to the host computer *both* a first command directing the host computer to transmit the message attachment to the mobile device, *and* a second command directing the host computer to transmit the message attachment to an external device capable of processing the attachment. The disclosure as originally filed does not support this sequence of steps.

Page 6 of the original specification describes that “configuration [of determining whether the mobile device can receive and process attachments] can be altered on a global or per message basis by transmitting a command message from the mobile device to the host system,” and separately describes that “the user may from a mobile communications device send a command message to the host system indicating that that attachment is to be sent to a fax machine at a hotel...”. Thus it appears that Applicant’s system is capable of sending different commands – one configuring the host computer regarding whether the mobile device can receive and process attachments, and another indicating that an attachment is to be sent to an external device. However, neither page 6, nor any other portion of the original specification discloses the claimed method of sending a first command message and a second command message, wherein both command messages relate to the *same* received message attachment, and wherein the first command message directs the host computer to transmit the message attachment to the mobile device, and the second message directs the host

computer to transmit the message attachment to an external device. Therefore, it does not appear that Applicant had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed, and so the amended claims constitute new matter.

Claims 38-52 depend from claim 24, and are thus rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 41 additionally adds new matter, because the original specification does not describe the steps of transmitting the first command message directing the host computer to transmit the message attachment to the mobile device, but then if the mobile communication device cannot process the attachment, then in response to receiving the first command message, not transmitting the message attachment to the wireless mobile communication device. In other words, the original specification does not disclose receiving at the wireless device some information regarding the attachment, sending a command message to the host computer directing it to transmit the attachment to the mobile device, and then ignoring the message at the host computer.

Prior Art

3. Applicant's amendments have overcome the prior art applied in the claim rejections given in the previous office action. However, the claims are not allowable at this time because of the 35 USC 112 rejections discussed above.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley Edelman whose telephone number is 571-272-3953. The examiner can normally be reached from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached at 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Bradley Edelman
BE
February 24, 2005